

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/541,535	07/09/2005	Rolf Sachse	82432	1494	
23685 KRIEGSMAN	7590 05/17/2007 & KRIEGSMAN	•	EXAM	EXAMINER	
30 TURNPIKI	E ROAD, SUITE 9	,	TRUONG, TAI	MTHOM NGO	
SOUTHBORG	OUGH, MA 01772		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1624		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		•	05/17/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/541,535	SACHSE, ROLF				
Office Action Sum	mary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Tamthom N. Truong	1624				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
A SHORTENED STATUTORY F WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FRC - Extensions of time may be available under after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing dat If NO period for reply is specified above, the - Failure to reply within the set or extended p Any reply received by the Office later than t earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CF	M THE MAILING DA the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 e of this communication. e maximum statutory period w eriod for reply will, by statute, hree months after the mailing	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be still apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the application to become ABANDO	ON. timely filed om the mailing date of this communication. NED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
 Responsive to communication(s) filed on 7-9-05 (Prel. Amdt). This action is FINAL. This action is non-final. Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. 							
Disposition of Claims							
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending 4a) Of the above claim(s) _ 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allow 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subjected	is/are withdraw ved. d. cted to.						
Application Papers							
	is/are: a) ☐ acce at any objection to the c s) including the correction	pted or b) objected to by the lrawing(s) be held in abeyance. Son is required if the drawing(s) is a	See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (P		4) Interview Summa Paper No(s)/Mail 5) Notice of Informa 6) Other:	Date				

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 08-06)

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's preliminary amendment of 7-9-05 is acknowledged. Claims 1-8 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, Second Paragraph

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

1. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Use Claims: Claims 1-8 provide for the use of compounds of formula I, but, since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Use Claims: Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition

Art Unit: 1624

4

of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. See for example *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd.App. 1967) and *Clinical Products, Ltd.* v. *Brenner*, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, First Paragraph

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

ረ

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Scope of Enablement: Should claims 1-8 be amended to recite methods, said claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a method of treating blood platelet aggregation, does not reasonably provide enablement for a method of treating myeloproliferative diseases, and bronchodilation. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The following factors have been considered in the determination of an enabling disclosure:

- (1) The breadth of the claims:
- (2) The amount of direction or guidance presented;
- (3) The state of the prior art;
- (4) The relative skill of those in the art;

Art Unit: 1624

- (5) The predictability or unpredictability of the art;
- (6) The quantity of experimentation necessary;

[See *Ex parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546 (Bd. Pat. App. & Int., 1986); also *In re Wands*, 858 F. 2d 731, 8 USPQ 2d 1400 (Fed. Cir. 1988)].

The breadth of the claims: Claims 1-8 recite the use of compounds of formula I for treating myeloproliferative diseases and for bronchodilation. Although the scope is not unduly broad, such a use is not substantiated by the specification and state of the art.

The amount of direction or guidance presented: The specification provides an *in-vivo* assay. However, the assay result is indicative of the claimed formula I as a prodrug for Anagrelide (an imidazoquinazoline compound) which is not known to have bronhodilating activity. The assay is not directed to the compound's activity to treat myeloproliferative diseases or its activity on bronchodilation. Thus, the specification fails to provide enablement for the claimed activity.

The state of the prior art: As recognized by the specification, Jenks et. al. (US 4,146,718) indicated that the compound of formula I can inhibit blood platelet aggregation. However, inhibiting platelet aggregation does not equate to treating myeloproliferative diseases, or bronchodilation. Thus, at best, the claimed compound can only reduce plaque, and increase circulation. Clearly, the treatment of myeloproliferative diseases, or bronchodilation is not supported by state of the art.

As for Anagrelide (the active drug), while it appears to treat polycythemia vera and essential thrombocythemia (forms of myeloproliferative diseases), it can have severe

Art Unit: 1624

cardiovascular side effects such as: myocardial infarction, complete heart block, atrial fibrillation, etc. as noted by Pescatore et. al. (Expert Opinion on Pharmacotherapy, 2000, Vol. 1(3), pp. 537-546). Because of its side effects, Anagrelide is not the drug of choice in treating myeloproliferative diseases, and must be used with caution.

The relative skill of those in the art: Even with the advanced training, the skilled clinician would have to carry out extensive research to select an effective compound from the large Markush group of formula I. Not only one has to determine an IC₅₀ value, but also *in-vivo* activity to establish an LD₅₀, therapeutic index and pharmacokinetic profile for each compound. Given the complexity of myeloproliferative diseases alone, such a task would require a tremendous amount of effort, time and resource.

The predictability or unpredictability of the art & The quantity of experimentation necessary: The pharmaceutical art has been known for its unpredictability due to various conflicting pathways, or biological factors that are sometimes genetically unique to individuals. In the instant case, the *in-vivo* assay provided does not establish a structure-activity-relationship (SAR) for the claimed formula I in treating myeloproliferative diseases, or bronchodilation.

See *Hoffman v. Klaus* 9 USPQ 2d 1657, and *Ex parte Powers* 220 USPQ 925 regarding type of testing needed to support *in vivo* uses.

Thus, given the unpredictable nature of the art, and the complexity of the intended diseases, one skilled in the art will have to engage in undue experimentation to practice the method of treatment recited in claims 1-8.

Art Unit: 1624

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

- 4. Claims 1-5, 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **Jenks et. al.** (US 4,146,718). In column 9, Example 1 describes a HBr salt of the compound of 5,6
 Dichloro-3.4-dihydro-2(1H)-iminoquinazoline-3-acetate, which is a tautomer form of a compound of the instant formula I with the following substituents:
 - i. R¹ is methyl;
 - ii. R² and R³ are hydrogen;
 - iii. R^4 and R^5 are Cl.

The disclosed compound has blood platelet antiaggregative properties, and thus reads on the instant claims since the claim language is directed to producing pharmaceutical compositions in which the intended use does not have patentable weight.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tamthom N. Truong whose telephone number is 571-272-0676. The examiner can normally be reached on M, T and Th (9:00-5:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James O. Wilson can be reached on 571-272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1624

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Tamthom N. Truong

Examiner Art Unit 1624

*** 5-8-07

EMILY BERNHARDT PRIMARY EXAMINER GROUP 1600